

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2004, the Examiner rejected claim under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to address this rejection. The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over Kontothanassis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,339) and Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,400) in further view of Yanai et al. (Yanai, U.S. Patent No. 5,742,792). The Examiner also rejected claims 6-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being patentable over Kontothanassis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,339) and Slaughter (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,400) in further view of Choquier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,668). In response to the prior art rejections, Applicant has amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are neither anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references

Independent claim 1 has been amended to require: a plurality of symbiotic partners communicatively coupled with one another, each of the plurality of symbiotic partners having a respective instance of a managed resource that includes a data file; at least two symbiotic partners of the plurality of symbiotic partners receiving input from a local user affecting a respective instance of the managed resource; the at least two symbiotic partners producing respective actions based upon the input and storing the respective actions; each of the at least two symbiotic partners awaiting availability of communication paths to each other of the plurality of symbiotic partners; the each of the at least two symbiotic partners transmitting respective actions to the each other of the plurality of symbiotic partners; the each other of the plurality of symbiotic partners receiving the respective actions from the each of the at least two symbiotic partners; the each other of the plurality of symbiotic partners using all outstanding respective actions to execute operations upon respective instances of the managed resource so that all of the

managed resources are affected in the same fashion, the operations including at least compilation, messaging, video editing, and display; and wherein when the each other of the plurality of symbiotic partners have used all outstanding respective actions to operate their respective instances of the managed resources, all instances of the managed resource are identical,

The cited references either singularly, or in combination disclose, suggest, or teach each of the elements of amended claim 1. For the reasons cited above, amended claim 1 is allowable. All claims depend from claim 1 and are allowable for these same reasons.

All pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is courteously solicited. Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2004

By: 

Bruce E. Garlick, Reg. 36,520

Garlick, Harrison & Markison
P.O. Box 160727
Austin, Texas 78716-0727
(512) 264-8816
(512) 264-3735 fax